	Case 2:21-cv-01210-KJM-CKD Docume	ent 11 Filed 08/24/21 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	VANESSA KAY WILLIAMSON,	No. 2:21-cv-1210 CKD P
12	Petitioner,	
13	v.	ORDER AND
14	DARRYL ADAMS,	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
15	Respondent.	
16		
17	On July 14, 2021, petitioner was ordered to file a request to proceed in forma pauperis or	
18	to pay the appropriate filing fee within thirty-days. The thirty-day period has now expired, and	
19	petitioner has not responded to the court's order, has not filed a request to proceed in forma	
20	pauperis, and has not paid the appropriate filing fee.	
21	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court assign a district	
22	court judge to this case; and	
23	IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice.	
24	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge	
25	assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days	
26	after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written	
27	objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned	
28	"Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." In the objections petitioner	
	1	

Case 2:21-cv-01210-KJM-CKD Document 11 Filed 08/24/21 Page 2 of 2

may address whether a certificate of appealability should issue in the event he files an appeal of	
the judgment in this case. See Rule 11, Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases (the distric	
court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the	
applicant). Where, as here, a habeas petition is dismissed on procedural grounds, a certificate of	
appealability "should issue if the prisoner can show: (1) 'that jurists of reason would find it	
debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling;' and (2) 'that jurists of	
reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a	
constitutional right." Morris v. Woodford, 229 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting Slack v.	
McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)). Any response to the objections shall be served and filed	
within fourteen days after service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file	
objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order.	
Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).	
Dated: August 24, 2021 Caroh U. Delany	
CAROLYN K. DELANEY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	

will1210.fifp